

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	F	ILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/848,047		05/03/2001	Viktor Ivanovich Petrik	101209,0002US1	5580	
34284	7590	05/04/2005		EXAM	EXAMINER	
ROBERT D. FISH				CINTINS,	CINTINS, IVARS C	
RUTAN & TUCKER LLP 611 ANTON BLVD 14TH FLOOR				ART UNIT	ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER	
COSTA MESA, CA 92626-1931				1724		

DATE MAILED: 05/04/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			W
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/848,047	PETRIK, VIKTOR IVAN	10/ICH
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit .	
	Ivars C. Cintins	1724	
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet wi	th the correspondence address	;
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a repl If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	136(a). In no event, however, may a r ly within the statutory minimum of thirt will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON e. cause the application to become AE	eply be timely filed by (30) days will be considered timely. THS from the mailing date of this community. ANDONED (35 U.S.C. & 133).	ication.
Status			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 F	ebruary 2005.		
2a)⊠ This action is FINAL . 2b)□ This	action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for allowa	nce except for formal matt	ers, prosecution as to the meri	its is
closed in accordance with the practice under E	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D	. 11, 453 O.G. 213.	
Disposition of Claims			
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>35-51</u> is/are pending in the application	n.		
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw	wn from consideration.		
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.			
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>35-51</u> is/are rejected.			
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.			
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	r election requirement.	•	
Application Papers			
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine	er.		
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acc	epted or b) objected to t	by the Examiner.	
Applicant may not request that any objection to the			
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct		, ,	21(d).
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 		119(a)-(d) or (f).	
2. Certified copies of the priority documents		onlication No	
3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior		· ——	ž
application from the International Bureau		Toolivaa iii ano Hadonai Glago	•
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list		eceived.	
Attachment(s)			
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview So	ummary (PTO-413)	
(2))/Mail Date	
I) M Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 9/29/2003.	5) Notice of in 6) Other:	formal Patent Application (PTO-152)	

Application/Control Number: 09/848,047

Art Unit: 1724

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. § 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 35-51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as based on a disclosure which is not enabling. The use of a mixture of expanded graphite and carbonaceous nanocrystals (i.e. nanotubes) appears to be critical and essential to the practice of the invention (see page 3, lines 9-11; and page 4, line 8 of the specification). Since the presence of expanded graphite in the treatment mixture has not been recited in claims 35-51, these claims are not enabled by the disclosure. *In re Mayhew*, 527 F.2d 1229, 188 USPQ 356 (CCPA 1976).

Claims 35-51 are also rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for the removal of chemical pollutants, does not reasonably provide enablement for other types of pollutants (e.g. biological pollutants such as bacteria, viruses, etc.). The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. § 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 35-51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Claims 35-51 fail to recite the apparently essential limitation that the carbonaceous material employed to remove pollutants includes a mixture of both expanded graphite and carbonaceous nanocrystals (i.e. nanotubes); and therefore, these claims fail to

Application/Control Number: 09/848,047

Art Unit: 1724

particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Also, claims 35-51 are incomplete because these claims merely recite forming an intermediate prior to the pollutant removal step, and fail to positively recite forming the carbonaceous mixture prior to this removal step. Furthermore, the term "using" (claim 35, last line) is vague, and indefinite as to the manipulative steps of the pollutant removal process.

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. § 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(d) the invention was first patented or caused to be patented, or was the subject of an inventor's certificate, by the applicant or his legal representatives or assigns in a foreign country prior to the date of the application for patent in this country on an application for patent or inventor's certificate filed more than twelve months before the filing of the application in the United States.

Claims 35-51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(d) as being clearly anticipated by Russian Patent No. 2,163,840 C1. The invention was first patented by the Applicant or his legal representatives or assigns in a foreign country (i.e. in Russia on March 10, 2001) prior to the date of the application for patent in this country (i.e. on May 3, 2001) on an application for patent filed more than twelve months (i.e. on September 30, 1999) before the filing of the application in the United States.

Applicant's arguments filed February 1, 2005 have been carefully considered, but no longer appear to be relevant in view of the new grounds of rejection. It is noted, however, that Applicant has admitted that Russian Patent No. 2,163,840 has a filing date of September 30, 1999 and an issue date of March 10, 2001 (see lines 2 and 6 in the paragraph below "Information Disclosure Statement" on page 4 of the response filed February 1, 2005); and therefore, this Russian patent is deemed to be available under 35 U.S.C. § 102(d).

Application/Control Number: 09/848,047

Art Unit: 1724

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new grounds of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to I. Cintins whose telephone number is (571) 272-1155. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:30 AM to 5:00 PM. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mr. Duane Smith, can be reached at (571) 272-1166.

The centralized facsimile number for the USPTO is (703) 872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

Art Unit: 1724

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Ivars C. Cintins
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1724

I. Cintins April 29, 2005